A U M

There is in all created beings an inconceivable light by which all good acts are performed, and in it, as in an immortal essence, is comprised whatever has been past, is present, or will be hereafter.—*Hindu Wisdom.*

Give to him that asketh.—*Udanavarga, 20-15.*

He delights in giving so far as he is able.—*Questions of King Milinda, B. 4, c, I, s. 9.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. VIII DECEMBER, 1919 No. 2

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

THE SPIRIT IN THE BODY*

For Spirit, when invested with matter or *prakriti,* experienceth the qualities which proceed from *prakriti;* its connection with these qualities is the cause of its rebirth in good and evil wombs. The Spirit in the body is called *Maheswara,* the Great Lord, the spectator, the admonisher, the sustainer, the enjoyer, and also the *Paramatma,* the highest soul.

—Bhagavad-Gita, Chapter XIII.

THERE is only one Perceiver; the sights are modified by the channels through which the Perceiver looks. It is—as you say—"the same Soul in any and all modifications." The power of seeing is the Soul; the power of the Soul goes into the seeing, hence what It "sees" are to It real because seen; as sights each is a reality; but the nature of Soul is different from any and all "sights."

The nature of Soul as unmodifiable must be grasped, then each sight is perceived as a relativity and there is no more identification than we assume when we see the many thousands of things that are about us every day, unaffected unless we concentrate upon them. We concentrate upon some things automatically, through habitude; this automatic habit has to be gradually changed, and *control* substituted. It is to be effected by trying to do it; keeping at it. The mind as at present constituted is *attracted* or repelled by externalities, and the power of the Soul flows in the direction of concentration, be that long or short. Through the Mind, the Soul determines bad, good, better, best on this or any plane; it has to be adjusted by knowledge of essential nature, of causes, and by analogies and

*From the Letters of Robert Crosbie, here published for the first time.—*Editor.*

correspondences. The views held in regard to existence constitute the Mind and direct the Soul's energy in that relation.

There is just "Consciousness" and its "states" which are conditioned consciousness. We speculate on conditions; we cannot on consciousness itself, for we are that. Sight, which sees all things cannot see itself. Sight sees, it cannot be seen. We cannot find ourselves in any kind or number of conditions; these are pictures in the mind. "It is of this stairway that thou art the mirror and faithful climber" might mean climbing beyond conditions; isn't that the "awakening of the Self" that the Upanishads speak of? A man in a dark room is conditioned by the darkness; in the open he is conditioned in other ways; but he is the same man. We must have knowledge in order to use power rightly, but we must know that we are neither knowledge nor power; they are ours; to imagine that we are any given knowledge or power is illusion. It might be said that there are two kinds of knowledge; knowledge of any and all conditions, and knowledge of the Self. Knowledge of the Self is beyond relativity; relativity cannot be known by relativity, but only by that which is beyond all relativity. "To blend thy Mind and Soul" is to make the Mind subservient to the purposes of Soul, an instrument for use, not a cage of relativities in which to imprison ourselves.

Isn't calmness "seeing" without being moved or involved? Self-identification is like the direct current of electricity which attracts the two poles; the other is an induced current in the secondary appliance.

"No action from a true basis could proceed far in an erroneous direction" is right; right basis is the compass; should wind or tide deflect the course, the compass is there to tell the story. We have many correct ideas in particulars, but forget the universal application of them. The fact that the Perceiver is One and Impartite, and that the "seeing" is looking directly on Ideas, is the basis of consideration. No idea is real, for on "looking" at it, motion is caused which spells "change;" the change is not so much in the object of vision, as in the mode of seeing; we are so liable to imagine that the change is external, and endeavor to adjust externalities to external change—an eternal and ineffectual struggle. We seek one of the pairs of opposites, instead of finding the basis of their unity, because of our desires.

Kama-loca means the plane or place of Desire. Doubt and Desire seem to go together, for wanting a thing implies the doubt of getting it, and intensity of doubt is expressed in fear; so we would have Desire, Doubt and Fear as the characteristics of the Kama-locic state. I think we have these about anything in life, and in accordance with our intensity attract similar energies from the Kama-locic state, whether emanating from living or dead personalities. Lengthy periods of Doubt and Fear are more intensive than shorter ones in their drawing power and subsequent effects.

We enter that current and receive from that plane so long as we hold on to it. But there is the other side; we can desire nothing for ourselves and determine to accept what comes; events and conditions come and go, and no amount of desiring will prevent their coming or hinder their going; taking this attitude we live in the Eternal and watch the wheel of Progress called change with neither desire, fear or doubt to assail us.

When we desire anything, it is not the thing itself that we want, but the feeling that the thing gives *us;* if the thing gave *us* no "feeling" we would not desire it. To do service is also "feeling," but how different in its effects; beneficial reactions instead of harmful.

What will we do when we hear and see what is in Kama-loca? I think that if we arrive at that we will know that we are looking at a condition, and will not be identified with it, unless we should choose to plunge into it in order to "feel" the state. Those in it know nothing but the desires and passions which animate them, think of nothing else; to them there is no other state.

I have read the articles you sent. They are all right in themselves, but they lack "point" in the direction we are concerned about. The writer brings out the fact that the existence of Masters was not first made known in the nineteenth century; of course not; the 'Ocean" and H. P. B. speak of Them and evidence of such a belief in many ways. But the evidence of past beliefs would have but little effect upon the present unless it were not only pointed out, but shown, that they are living Men. The main thing that was shown and needs constant pointing to, is the fact that these past beliefs referred to past efforts of the Lodge, and that the close of the nineteenth century marked Their latest effort through Their chosen messenger. To say that the accumulated knowledge of the ages is not new, is to say nothing; from this point of view the articles would mislead the ordinary reader, and we are not in that business.

We keep hammering away on Theosophy; people hear us say the same thing time and again. They think they get the meaning all the time, but as a matter of fact, they get more and more of the inner meanings as they listen and think, as well as try to apply. Some take the attitude of knowing what is meant by the words used; they get accustomed to them and on hearing them feel that they know them; they would like something new and strange, and oftentimes are simply bored by the repetition. It is clear to us, however, that one can hardly exhaust the shades of meaning and applications that can be made in regard to these apparent commonplaces. Well, some do get their spiritual eyes opened little by little; they are not the ones who are either bored or complain.

"To abstain from condemning others" is a course to be continually striven for; it is vital. As you say, no two really act from the same basis of perception, so how can anyone judge? It should

be granted that each one is trying to do his best; the best that he knows. His knowledge may be small, but if he strives to do the best he knows, his knowledge increases. For myself, I have an end in view in what I do; not my end, but something which includes many others—all if possible. Whether a temple is intended or a building for a saloon, similar work has to be performed; so actions —as you say—are no safe basis to judge from. As students get to understand this in regard to each other, each in his degree, better results may be confidently expected. We credit each other with the best of motives and let it go at that; any other way leads to confusion and misunderstanding—hence separative thought and action.

"What do people get 'mad' about?" I think, generally, something another has done, or failed to do; or some fancied slight. We feel annoyed at the circumstances really, not the person, although we foolishly confuse the two. Now a thing done, is done; no amount of irritation can change it. What is needed is a consideration of what led up to the doing; this should be taken up as calmly as any other proposition. If some one annoys you or irritates you by manner or action, it is to be assumed that he is not doing it on purpose to annoy. Try to understand his viewpoint; examine the man's machinery, just as you would a machine. Some people have been known to get mad at a machine, and feel destruction in regard to it; but where is the fault? The machine can't learn anything; the man can, and needs to. The main trouble, I think, is that most people consider it perfectly proper to make their likes and dislikes a basis for action; everything is judged from that basis. This, of course, is altogether wrong, although very common. *We are not called upon for judgment, but for right action; to act rightly ourselves, and by precept and example induce it in others.* If we essay this task, it will at once appear that we cannot act rightly unless calmly. So we have to cultivate Calmness under all circumstances; it is like a rock; waves of irritation may dash at it, but cannot affect it; it can be attained by seeing the necessity for it, and by endeavor which is constant. It comes from "resting in the Real," which is never moved, but moves all things, sees all.

So if we take all these things as just our "tryouts," we will be able to get the right view of them and the right attitude. These things in themselves do not matter, it does matter that we are unshaken.

Of course, I am saying these things to myself, for you know them right well, only sometimes we forget and revert to habitude. But there is always that place which is never moved, to rest on and in. So with confidence in Them we go forward, and may Peace be ever ours.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE SOUL*

THE Soul is pictured in the ancient teachings as the real Self of man. There are many different conceptions of what man is and what the soul. From Christian teachings we are led to believe that man *has* a soul, and may save it or lose it, and that, I think, is the idea generally held in the West.

But the conception of the ancients,—and that of Theosophy is a re-presentation of that eternal idea—is different. This teaching is that Man *is* a Soul; that Soul is in fact the one who perceives; that it is vision itself, pure and simple, unmodified—that is, not subject to change—and that it looks directly on ideas.

This idea presents the fact that the real Man in whatever condition he may be existing, whether asleep or awake, whether in a physical body during his lifetime, or whether in another form of body after death or before birth, or before the existence of this planet or this solar system—that this real Man was the same Perceiver then as now—the same Soul all the time; the Creator of all the conditions that have arisen; the *intelligent* Creator of this universe, in connection with all the beings below him and all the beings above him. Man thus forms part of one great Brotherhood, and this bond of brotherhood extends throughout, from the lowest being to the very highest.

They are all Souls; even the very lowest forms of matter are none the less Souls, for in the lowest form of matter is the power to perceive, the power to act, the power to gain experience.

The potentiality is the same in all, and that potentiality becomes a potency ever expanding as the Soul increases its range of experience. All the forms, the bodies, that compose the universe are the results of the experience and action of the souls inhabiting them. They are all the instruments of the soul, and we always act with others in any grade or class of beings.

There is that unity of action which produces a similarity of instrument; in these similarities of instruments we play upon and are played upon by beings of the same class in the fullest degree, and by lower and higher classes in a greater or less degree.

So, taking this conception that the Self is the same in each being, no matter how great that being may be, or how low, we get another idea in regard to soul: that soul also represents the acquired experience gained through evolution by each and every class of being. Each individual being is not only Self, but in addition the acquired experience gained through contact with all other beings. Realizing that there are individual souls, we can see that the only differences between souls are in their degrees of acquired experience. Taking the soul from this point of view, then, as the acquired experience of individuals, when we speak of God, or the

*From the stenographic report of a talk by Robert Crosbie. Here published for the first time.—*Editors.*

Over-Soul, the Universal Over-Soul, we simply mean the acquired experiences, or wisdom, of every soul and all souls. That would be the meaning of the sentence in the Gita that the Self is "Wisdom" itself, the object of Wisdom and that which is to be acquired by Wisdom"—full consciousness of the union of all-souls, or Spiritual Identity.

If we are to try to relate these conceptions to the idea of language we would, perhaps, have to clear up many ideas which we now hold. Supposing there is a real language of the soul, what would it be capable of expressing? *Undoubtedly every experience through which it had ever been.*

Theosophy teaches the doctrine of reincarnation; that is, of successive lives, both on this earth and in other states of substance and consciousness. Continuity of Consciousness (or Spirit) is preserved through all these, and the record of all that occurred in all these lives is present at all times in any one life in manifestation, because the Self, the Spirit, is present. The language of the Soul would be capable of expressing *all* that we ever experienced.

In those past lives we have undoubtedly spoken different languages from those we now speak; in those personal existences we used languages now altogether deserted and forgotten by us as persons. But the memory of those languages must be there, if we are a continuing Self and preserve the continuity of experiences gained as well as the continuity of consciousness. Those old languages which we once used in themselves amount to nothing, because any language and all languages, are only the expression of the feeling and thought of the individual soul; his emotions, hopes, fears, ideas and aspirations. So there must be at all times behind any language whatever, the basis for it—the Soul and its experience. Where is that recorded?

It is impacted in the imperishable part of man's nature. It cannot be any spoken tongue whatever. What, then, is its nature?

To understand these two propositions we have again to consider the philosophy of Theosophy. Theosophy points out that matter is in seven states or degrees of substances, and each of these with seven sub-states; the whole ranging from the very finest, most plastic and enduring state down to the very coarsest—what we may call the material plane, or matter as it is known and suspected by us, with its many differing gradations and combinations. Man, as the highest and most evolved being concerned in the evolution of this solar system, is clothed in all these seven states of substance derived from the original primordial substance—the homogeneus matter from which every form is evolved. These are indicated in the seven colors of the spectrum; they are also pointed to in the seven notes of the scale of music.

These notes and colors are not exactly what we think they are: they represent the seven great distinct states of matter; and sound itself, or light itself, represent the homogeneus state from which the seven notes and the seven prismatic colors are derived.

Our colors and our musical notes are only replicas of these—their reflections or correspondences in this one state of matter and sound with which we are acquainted.

We know there are seven colors; and we know that there are other octaves of color beyond those which our eyes are unable to transmit to us; some so high, some so low, that our eyes will not transmit their vibrations. The same is true with sound. We are able to detect several, but there are degrees of sound beyond the highest we are able to detect, and also sounds too low for us to hear.

Let us call the Soul the Ego; perhaps that, for us, is the most compact expression for what is meant by Soul, for it includes both the one who perceives and his perceptions; both the one who knows and his experiences. Well, then, the Ego has a language of his own, and that language is one of color, sound and symbol. It is a language that may be seen; that may be heard; that may be felt. It is by means of this language of the soul that the experiences of others may become *directly* known to us, comprehensible to us, no matter what vocal tongues we may use. This is why it was said in old times, and is mentioned in the Bible, that the Wise understood every man speaking in his own tongue, although many different languages were used, then as now. It was because these Wise men could read back of the spoken language, that they knew the very thoughts, feelings and natures of the speakers. And that is why by any person's motion, even so simple an action as in moving from one chair to another, the quality of the thought, the very nature of the person, is clearly shown by the assemblage of colors and shades of colors produced by the action. And the same with any uttered sounds or speech, no matter what: the centers in the body are set in motion, and each has its own particular telltale colors and rates of vibration.

Strange as it may seem to us, colors may be heard, sounds may be seen, and forms may be experienced, because all are merely different rates of vibration—the motion of Intelligent Consciousness, or Spirit. They are all correlated, and one does not exist without the others. They are merely aspects of that which is the real propulsion of the soul itself, or the conscious being.

So, in our thoughts we have a great combination of colors and sounds, and these are constantly changing their form, or appearance. Our brain is the finest material instrument we use. It, like everything else we use, is an evolution. It is the organ of thought on this plane of substance where we are now acting. If we think high and noble thoughts, then our brains become very susceptible to that kind of use. Every kind of thought has its own particular rate and range of vibration, its own particular colors. If we were acquainted with ourselves in reality, we could read thought as we now read a book. We could read thoughts as we now hear sounds.

If our brains are trained to high thoughts while we are awake; if we try to understand what we really are while occupying this physical instrument, and what this body of ours represents, what it is capable of—then gradually the brain will begin to respond to something of our higher knowledge. It will carry forward and transmit more and more of the Language of the Soul, of all the garnered experience of the past.

The ideas that we have, even in regard to Spirit and Soul, to Life hitherto, here and hereafter, are those we have been taught. They are nearly all personal and keep us entirely on the personal plane—the plane of merely physical existence. They give us no true ideas whatever of the real inner self. We have not yet *begun to think*—in any true sense, in any true direction, and it is only those that will give us knowledge of the inner nature of man. Our habits are merely memory impacted in our nature—whether they be habits of body or habits of thought. We do not store knowledge anywhere but within ourselves; but sometimes we forget where we have hidden it, or we cover it up with a lot of the useless rubbish of mere mental activity. Most of our mental activity is applied solely to the things of this life, to things of the body; and so mankind is continually moving along a false path. No being, however high, can prevent this, because each man is Soul, is Spirit, is Consciousness—is of the Highest, however he use and apply his powers.

Theosophy endeavors to present to man what his real nature is; that he is first, last, and all the time SPIRIT. And remember that Spirit means Life and Consciousness—the *power* to see, to know, to experience. We all have that. That is common to all of us. It is not separate in itself—it is the One Life in all beings of every grade. But we, as individuals, have evolved into individuals from the great Ocean of Life. We are Individualized Spirit, and so we each have a separate individual existence, and that is continuous. In that sense we are an evolution, but an evolution of Spirit, not Matter—an evolution of Knowledge, and not of form only. This has been obtained through observation and experience; and whatever differences exist are only because of more or less experience, or a better adaptation and application of it—there is no difference in the Source or Potentialities of any being.

All this we will find out, if we move along the Path shown. For it is not an uncharted path. Remember, others have been along that path before us. They are our Elder Brothers. Jesus, for example; Buddha for another; and all those who came at different times as Saviours to the many different peoples. They had all acquired the Language of the Soul. They all had a common body of knowledge. They come amongst men from time to time, as the intelligence of humanity progresses, and give out as much of that knowledge as the then existing state of humanity permits.

They came again in our own time; and greater than Those who so came there has not been. Why should anyone say that? Because other Saviours came to separate and distinct peoples, but

the Message of Theosophy is not to any one nation, any one class of beings, but to the whole world.

That knowledge is obtainable by any self-conscious being for himself, for it is not a question of our ideas, or our present perceptions of morality or success, or of external power, but of *Spiritual perception*—of the *Language of the Soul.* We may make all the mistakes in the world—according to the world—in the body and through the body; and yet have a power of Spiritual perception that would do away with all these. We would not have to have any vicarious atonement, but would be able to act in a proper relation with every being. Our thoughts and actions would be in accord. But we would have to go through the crucifixion of the false ideas in ourselves, and arise as the Saviour did, to the right hand of the Father—the Ego free from all these delusions which have caused him to maintain himself in sin, sorrow and suffering.

All men desire Spiritual knowledge, yet the great bulk will not abate one jot or tittle of their mental and physical absorption in present and worldly things, though they say they ardently long for Spiritual knowledge. They will have to move on through suffering and pain till they really desire to know the truth about themselves.

If any man thinks he can get that knowledge by merely desiring to possess it, or by desiring to possess it for himself alone, he is not in the position that would permit of his knowing it. The Language of the Soul can only be acquired when the being realizes that his duty is not to himself, but to the highest interests of his fellowmen; not to "save his own soul" but to lead as many of his neighbors as he possibly can in the direction of the Truth, desiring nothing for himself. That very attitude opens the flood-gates of spiritual knowledge within himself. Then he becomes the true enjoyer, using every power he has, all the knowledge he has, to benefit others. The man who has come to that knowledge and is on the road to its realization finds "spiritual knowledge springing up spontaneously in himself in the progress of time." He requires no books to tell him; he cares not what religions have been, or that now are, or that ever will be. He knows the truth about himself, and consequently the truth about all others.

Why do not all men take the path to this realization? Is it because they have no organs of perception, are incapable of seeing? No; it is because they will not listen; they will not take what is given and try it out. They will rather follow anything that promises some success in this life. Yet they know just as well as anyone that they cannot take one single one of these "successes" away with them from the earth. When they go, they leave on earth every earthly thing they have accumulated. And they have to go, because they do not belong here; they are of Spirit, not earth; they are only working in this matter for awhile. They all know that, and yet dream of "possessions."

No one damned any of us to this condition in which we find so many. No conditions compel us to stay in a state of mental

unrest, inactivity or ignorance. All these things are imposed on us by our own hard and fast conclusions as to men, things and methods. These keep us fast bound in our present conditions and will continue to keep us as long as we maintain that attitude of mind, and cling to false ideas of God, of Nature, and of Man. We keep the doors closed of our own wills. In ignorance? Yes; but who remains ignorant? Those only who will not hear, those only who doubt, the Language of the Soul.

THE DOUBTFUL MIND

"IT IS one thing," says the Upanishad, "to have that knowledge which the disciple possesses. It is quite another thing to be a disciple."

All spiritual teachings are full of "dark sayings." This, perhaps, is one of them, and seems to indicate that truth is best conveyed by paradox—the English equivalent of the "pairs of opposites" of Bhagavad-Gita.

Men and women everywhere accept life, cling to life, long for "life, more life," while still questioning nearly everything that happens to them. Tossed about between good and evil circumstances they strive to cling to the one and avoid the other, never seeking the Truth in this pair of opposites. The votaries of the different religions believe in their respective gods; they believe in special providence; they believe in eternal justice. Yet they fear; they doubt this, they question that. Their faith is a plea in avoidance.

We all know, probably, persons who have heard all about swimming, who know that swimming is possible, that it can be learned, and who can tell you all about the laws and principles of swimming, its benefits and advantages—but who can't swim. All that they do is to talk and wear a bathing suit now and then—on dry land; and perhaps now and then disport themselves in shallow water. Thrown into the deep they could neither save another nor themselves.

This kind of knowledge and this sort of faith are called in the Voice of the Silence the "eye doctrine." Those who have it are very complacent and content when all things succeed and come to pass according to their desires. But when the great ocean of life takes from them their pleasant possessions, or brings to their feet things hard to bear, they at once become of doubtful mind and question and complain of the inequalities of life.

And when at last they are torn loose from their moorings in the safe harbor of agreeable circumstances and swept away in the currents of events they lose their faith in God, in Law and in themselves, and become mere flotsam and jetsam—"the victims of circumstances," as they tell themselves.

No one of us is free from this reliance upon circumstances when they are conformable to our desires. No one of us is free from the doubtful mind when circumstances present a forbidding front.

We have to face two things: our circumstances, of which we think ourselves the creatures or the beneficiaries; and ourselves, the creators of those circumstances, whether they be good or evil. We cannot summon the courage to do this through any applications of the "eye doctrine."

Only the "heart doctrine" can give true humility in pleasant surroundings, true courage in unfavorable circumstances. And in the heart doctrine there is no room for the "doubtful mind." It proceeds—the doubtful mind—from the lack of a recognition of the reign of Law in every thing and in every circumstance; from a non-perception of the One Spirit in all things whether they be good or evil; from a non-recognition of our own immortal nature in the midst of all perishable things.

Merely to believe in the eternal bases of all action, all knowledge and all life is not enough, as many have found to their sorrow when their "hour of trial" came. Their "faith" dissolved like mist in sunlight; doubts sucked away their courage like a quicksand, engulfing them in the blackness of despair.

All of us "know" the mysterious Secret Doctrine in its principles, and something of its processes and applications—but who of us *realizes it* in daily life? Who amongst us is in the conscious enjoyment of his immortality here and now, in the midst of this body and these circumstances? All of us long to be "delivered from evil," all of us long for happiness that is inalienable. We are of doubtful mind whether this be possible here in the world. We all of us question, not merely the foundations of our happiness, but the foundation of all happiness.

Yet, if Theosophy be the true Gospel, he who comes into the realization of it should soon learn to stand beyond all pain, all misery, as beyond all the wear and tear of change, which is the chief originator of pain; should experience everlasting life even while in temporary bodies of short duration; should have a conscious existence in Spirit, not matter, even while incarnated upon this earth.

We think Buddha, Jesus, Krishna, H. P. Blavatsky, and many others, have had this realization, whatever their lives may appear to us, and however we might suffer in the same circumstances. What is their secret; that most mysterious knowledge which enabled them to enter this world of spiritual darkness, to become in all things like unto us, to share our evil case, and yet to remain masters alike of fate and of fortune?

"Realization," said Mr. Judge, "comes from dwelling on the thing to be realized." Applying this, each to himself, we may see

that we dwell more or less constantly on good and particularly upon evil. Good and evil occupy all our thoughts and inspire all our actions. How, then, should we not realize the pairs of opposites, and doubt all else?

But suppose, instead of dwelling upon the body and circumstances, our constant undercurrent of meditation were upon the Spirit in the midst of all forms, Law in the midst of all actions, ourselves as Creators in the midst of created Nature—would not the realization of the immortal begin to dawn for us?

The Master becomes; He is not made; He is a self-creation.

The moment that we begin to act and to think from the triune basis of the Eternal Pilgrim, each man becomes to himself absolutely the Way, the Truth, and the Life. "But he is only so when he recognizes this personality as not himself, but as that thing which he has with pain created for his own use, and by means of which he purposes, as his growth slowly develops his intelligence, to reach to the life beyond personality."

All this may be achieved by the development of unselfish, universal love for Humanity, and the suppression of personality, or *selfishness*—the cause of all sin, as of all human sorrow.

The lair of the doubtful mind is in our selfishness and personal nature. We only can "cut all doubts" with the sword of the Spiritual nature.

FROM THE PATH*

All that we are is the result of what we have thought; it is founded on our thoughts; it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with an evil thought pain follows him as the wheel follows the foot of him who draws the carriage.

All that we are is the result of what we have thought; it is founded on our thoughts; it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with a pure thought, happiness follows him like a shadow that never leaves him.—*Dhammapada.*

Receive this law, young men; keep, read, fathom, teach, promulgate and preach it to all beings. I am not avaricious nor narrow minded; I am confident and willing to impart Buddha knowledge, or knowledge of the self-born. I am a bountiful giver, young men, and ye should follow my example; imitate me in liberality, showing this knowledge, and preaching this code of laws and conduct to those who shall successively gather round you, and rouse unbelieving persons to accept this law. By so doing ye will acquit your debt to the Tathagatas.—*Saddharma Pundarika.*

*These Extracts were printed by William Q. Judge in *The Path,* May, 1886. The title used is our own. [EDITORS THEOSOPHY.]

LE PHARE DE L'INCONNU*

(Continued from November)

III.

DO our benevolent critics always know what they are laughing at? Have they the smallest idea of the work which is being performed in the world and the mental changes that are being brought about by that Theosophy at which they smile? The progress already due to our literature is evident, and, thanks to the untiring labours of a certain number of Theosophists, it is becoming recognized even by the blindest. There are not a few who are persuaded that Theosophy will be the philosophy and the law, if not the religion of the future. The party of reaction, captivated by the *dolce far niente* of conservatism, feel all this, hence come the hatred and persecution which call in criticism to their aid. But criticism, inaugurated by Artistotle, has fallen far away from its primitive standard. The ancient philosophers, those sublime ignoramuses as regards modern civilization, when they criticised a system or a work, did so with impartiality, and with the sole object of amending and improving that with which they found fault. First they studied the subject, and then they analysed it. It was a service rendered, and was recognized and accepted as such by both parties. Does modern criticism always conform to that golden rule? It is very evident that it does not.

Our judges of today are far below the level even of the philosophical criticism of Kant. Criticism, which takes unpopularity and prejudice for its canons, has replaced that of "pure reason;" and the critic ends by tearing to pieces with his teeth everything he does not comprehend, and especially whatever he does not care in the least to understand. In the last century—the golden age of the goose-quill—criticism was biting enough sometimes; but still it did justice. Caesar's wife might be suspected, but she was never condemned without being heard in her defense. In our century Montyon prizes[1], and public statues are for him who invents the most murderous engine of war; today, when the steel pen has replaced its more humble predecessor, the fangs of the Bengal tiger or the teeth of the terrible saurian of the Nile would make wounds less cruel and less deep than does the steel nib (*bec*) of the modern critic, who is almost always absolutely ignorant of that which he tears so thoroughly to pieces.

It is some consolation, perhaps, to know that the majority of our literary critics, transatlantic and continental, are ex-scribblers who have made a fiasco in literature, and are revenging themselves

---

*This translation of an article by H. P. B., first printed in *La Revue Theosophique*, is reprinted from *The Theosophist* for August, 1889.

1. (Prizes instituted in France during the last century by the Baron de Montyon for those who, in various ways, benefited their fellowmen.—*Ed. The Theosophist.*)

now for their mediocrity upon everything they come across. The small blue wine, insipid and doctored, almost always turns into very strong vinegar. Unfortunately, the reporters of the press in general—hungry poor devils whom we would be sorry to grudge the little they make, even at our own expense—are not our only or our most dangerous critics. The bigots and the materialists—the sheep and goats of religions—having placed us in turn in their *index expurgatorius,* our books are banished from their libraries, our journals are boycotted, and ourselves subjected to the most complete ostracism. One pious soul, who accepts literally the miracles of the Bible, following with emotion the ichthyographical investigations of Jonas in the whale's belly, or the trans-ethereal journey of Elias, when like a salamander he flew off in his chariot of fire, nevertheless regards the Theosophists as wonder-mongers and cheats. Another—*áme damnée* of Hæckel—while he displays a credulity as blind as that of the bigot in his belief in the evolution of man and the gorilla from a common ancestor (considering the total absence of every trace in nature of any connecting link whatever), nearly dies with laughing when he finds that his neighbour believes in occult phenomena and psychic manifestations. Nevertheless, neither the bigot nor the man of science, nor even the academician, counted among the number of the "Immortals," can explain to us the smallest of the problems of existence. The metaphysician who for centuries has studied the phenomena of being in their first principles, and who smiles pityingly when he listens to the wanderings of Theosophy, would be greatly embarrassed to explain to us the philosophy or even the cause of dreams. Which of them can tell us why all the mental operations,—except reasoning, which faculty alone finds itself suspended and paralysed—go on while we dream with as much activity and energy as when we are awake? The disciple of Herbert Spencer would send any one to the biologist who squarely asked him that question. But he, for whom digestion is the *alpha* and *omega* of every dream—like hysteria, that great Proteus with a thousand forms, which is present in every psychic phenomena—can by no means satisfy us. Indigestion and hysteria are, in fact, twin sisters, two goddesses, to whom the modern psychologist has raised an altar at which he has constituted himself the officiating priest. But this is his business so long as he does not meddle with the gods of his neighbours.

From all this it follows that, since the Christian characterizes Theosophy as the "accursed science" and the forbidden fruit; since the man of science sees nothing in metaphysics but "the domain of the crazy poet" (Tyndall); since the "reporter" touches it only with poisoned forceps; and since the missionaries associate it with idolatry and "the benighted Hindu"—it follows, we say, that poor *Theo-Sophia* is as shamefully treated as she was when the ancients called her the TRUTH—while they relegated her to the bottom of a well. Even the "Christian" Kabalists, who love so much to mirror themselves in the dark waters of this deep well, although they see noth-

ing there but the reflection of their own faces, which they mistake for that of the Truth—even the Kabalists make war upon us. Nevertheless, all that is no reason why Theosophy should have nothing to say in its own defense, and in its favour; or that it should cease to assert its right to be listened to, or why its loyal and faithful servants should neglect their duty by acknowledging themselves beaten.

"The accursed science," you say, good Ultramontanes? You should remember, nevertheless, that the tree of science is grafted on the tree of life. That the fruit which you declare "forbidden," and which you have proclaimed for sixteen centuries to be the cause of the original sin that brought death into the world,—that this fruit, whose flower blossoms on an immortal stem, was nourished by that same trunk, and that therefore it is the only fruit which can insure us immortality. You also, good Kabalists, ignore—or wish to ignore—that the allegory of the earthly paradise is as old as the world, and that the tree, the fruit and the sin had once a far profounder and more philosophic signification than they have today—when the secrets of initiation are lost.

Protestantism and Ultramontanism are opposed to Theosophy, just as they are opposed to everything not emanating from themselves; as Calvinism opposed the replacing of its two fetishes, the Jewish Bible and Sabbath, by the Gospel and the Christian Sunday; as Rome opposed secular education and Free-masonry. Dead-letter and theocracy have, however, had their day. The world must move and advance under penalty of stagnation and death. Mental evolution progresses *pari passu* with physical evolution, and both advance towards the ONE TRUTH,—which is the heart of the system of Humanity, as evolution is the blood. Let the circulation stop for one moment, and the heart stops at the same time, and it is all up with the human machine! And it is the servants of Christ who wish to kill, or at least paralyze, the Truth by the blows of a club which is called "the letter that kills!" But the end is nigh. That which Coleridge said of political despotism applies also to religious. The Church, unless she withdraws her heavy hand, which weighs like a nightmare on the oppressed bosoms of millions of believers whether they resent it or not, and whose reason remains paralyzed in the clutch of superstition, the ritualistic church is sentenced *to give up its place to Religion* and—to die. Soon it will have but a choice. For once the people become enlightened about the truth which it hides with so much care, one of two things will happen, the Church will either perish *by* the people, or else, if the masses are left in ignorance and in slavery to the dead letter, it will perish *with* the people. Will the servants of eternal Truth—out of which Truth they have made a squirrel that runs round an ecclesiastical wheel—will they show themselves sufficiently *altruistic* to choose the first of these alternative necessities? Who knows?

I say it again; it is only theosophy, well understood, that can save the world from despair, by reproducing social and religious re-

form—a task once before accomplished in history, by Gautama, the Buddha: a peaceful reform, without one drop of blood spilt, each one remaining in the faith of his fathers if he so chooses. To do this he will only have to reject the parasitic plants of human fabrication, which at the present moment are choking all religions and churches in the world. Let him accept but the essence, which is the same in all; that is to say, the spirit which gives life to man in whom it resides, and renders him immortal. Let every man inclined to go on find his ideal—a star before him to guide him. Let him follow it, without ever deviating from his path; and he is almost certain to reach the Beacon-light of life—the TRUTH: no matter whether he seeks for and finds it at the bottom of a cradle or of a well.

IV.

Laugh, then, at the science of sciences without knowing the first word of it! We will be told, perhaps, that such is the literary right of our critics. With all my heart. If people always talked about what they understood, they would only say things that are true, and—that would not always be so amusing. When I read the criticisms now written on Theosophy, the platitudes and the stupid ridicule employed against the most grandiose and sublime philosophy in the world—one of whose aspects only is found in the noble ethics of Philalethes—I ask myself whether the Academies of any country have ever understood the Theosophy of the Philosophers of Alexandria better than they understood us now? What does any one know, what can he know, of Universal Theosophy, unless he has studied under the masters of wisdom? And understanding so little of Iamblicus, Plotinus and even Proclus, that is to say, of the Theosophy of the third and fourth centuries, people yet pride themselves upon delivering judgment on the Neo-Theosophy of the nineteenth!

Theosophy, we say, comes to us from the extreme East, as did the Theosophy of Plotinus and Iamblicus and even the mysteries of ancient Egypt. Do not Homer and Herodotus tell us, in fact, that the ancient Egyptians were "Ethiopians of the East," *who came from Lanka or Ceylon,* according to their descriptions? For it is generally acknowledged that the people whom those two authors call *Ethiopians of the East* were no other than a colony of very dark skinned Aryans, the Dravidians of Southern India, who took an already existing civilization with them to Egypt. This migration occurred during the prehistoric ages which Baron Bunson calls *pre-Menite* (before Menes) but which ages have a history of their own, to be found in the ancient annals of Kalouka Batta. Besides, and apart from the esoteric teachings, which are not divulged to a mocking public, the historical researches of Colonel Vans Kennedy, the great rival in India of Dr. Wilson as a Sanskritist, show us that pre-Assyrian Babylonia was the home of Brahmanism, and of the Sanskrit as a sacerdotal language. We know also, if Exodus is to be believed, that Egypt had, long before the time of Moses,

its diviners, its hierophants and its magicians, that is to say, before the XIX dynasty. Finally Brugsh Bey sees in many of the gods of Egypt, immigrants from beyond the Red Sea—and the great waters of the Indian Ocean.

Whether that be so or not, Theosophy is a descendant in direct line of the great tree of universal GNOSIS, a tree the luxuriant branches of which, spreading over the whole earth like a great canopy, gave shelter at one epoch—which biblical chronology is pleased to call "antediluvian"—to all the temples and to all the nations of the earth. That gnosis represents the aggregate of all the sciences, the accumulated wisdom *(savior)* of all the gods and demigods incarnated in former times upon the earth. There are some who would like to see in these, the fallen angels and the enemy of mankind; these sons of God who, seeing that the daughters of men were beautiful, took them for wives and imparted to them the secrets of heaven and earth. Let them think so. We believe in Avatars and in divine dynasties, in the epoch when there were, in fact, "giants upon the earth," but we altogether repudiate the idea of "fallen angels," and of Satan and his army.

"What then is your religion or your belief?" we are asked. "What is your favourite study?"

"The TRUTH," we reply. The truth wherever we can find it; for, like Ammonius Saccas, our greatest ambition would be to reconcile the different religious systems, to help each one to find the truth in his own religion, while obliging him to recognize it in that of his neighbour. What does the name signify if the thing itself is essentially the same? Plotinus, Iamblicus and Apollonius of Tyana, had all three, it is said, the wonderful gifts of prophecy, of clairvoyance, and of healing, although belonging to three different schools. Prophecy was an art that was cultivated by the Essenes and the *B'ni Nebim* among the Jews, as well as by the priests of the pagan oracles. Plotinus's disciples attributed miraculous powers to their master; Philostratus has claimed the same for Apollonius, while Iamblicus had the reputation of surpassing all the other Eclectics in Theosophic theurgy. Ammonius declared that all moral and practical WISDOM was contained in the books of Thoth or Hermes Trismegistus. But Thoth means "a college," school or assembly, and the works of that name, according to the *Theodidactos,* were identical with the doctrines of the sages of the extreme East. If Pythagoras acquired his knowledge in India (when even now he is mentioned in old manuscripts under the name of Yavanachârya,* the Greek Master), Plato gained his from the books of Thoth-Hermes. How it happened that the younger Hermes, the god of the shepherds, surnamed "the good shepherd," who presided over divination and clairvoyance, became identical with Thoth (or Thot) the deified sage, and the author of the *Book of the Dead*—the esoteric doctrine only can reveal to Orientalists.

---

*A term which comes from the words *Yavana* or "the Ionian," and *acharya,* "professor or master."

Every country has had its saviours. He who dissipates the darkness of ignorance by the help of the torch of science, thus discovering to us the truth, deserves that title as a mark of our gratitude quite as much as he who saves us from death by healing our bodies. Such an one awakens in our benumbed souls the faculty of distinguishing the true from the false, by kindling a divine flame hitherto absent, and he has the right to our grateful worship, for he has become our creator. What matters the name or the symbol that personifies the abstract idea, if that idea is always the same and is true! Whether the concrete symbol bears one title or another, whether the saviour in whom we believe has for an earthly name Krishna, Buddha, Jesus or Aesculapius,—also called "the savior god" Σώτηρ,—we have but to remember one thing: symbols of divine truths were not invented for the amusement of the ignorant; they are the *alpha* and *omega* of philosophic thought.

Theosophy being the way that leads to truth, in every religion as in every science, occultism is, so to say, the touchstone and universal solvent. It is the thread of Ariadne given by the master to the disciple who ventures into the labyrinth of the mysteries of being; the torch that lights him through the dangerous maze of life, for ever the enigma of the Sphinx. But the light thrown by this torch can be discerned only by the eye of the awakened soul—by our spiritual senses; it blinds the eye of the materialist as the sun blinds that of the owl.

Having neither dogma nor ritual—these two being but fetters, the material body which suffocates the soul—we do not employ the "ceremonial magic" of the Western Kabalists; we know its dangers too well to have anything to do with it. In the T. S. every Fellow is at liberty to study what he pleases, provided he does not venture into unknown paths which would of a certainty lead him to *black magic*—the sorcery against which Eliphas Levi so openly warned the public. The occult sciences are dangerous for him who understands them imperfectly. Any one who gave himself up to their practice by himself, would run the risk of becoming insane; and those who study them would do well to unite in little groups of from three to seven. These groups ought to be uneven in numbers in order to have more power; a group, however little cohesion it possesses, forming a single united body, wherein the senses and perceptions of those who work together complement and mutually help each other, one number supplying to another the quality in which he is wanting—such a group will always end by becoming a perfect and invincible body. "Union is strength." The moral of the fable of the old man bequeathing to his sons a bundle of sticks which were never to be separated is a truth which will forever remain axiomatic.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

(To be continued)

(The foregoing article is a rough translation of an article in the *Revue Theosophique* for June.—*Ed. The Theosophist.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

At the meetings of the United Lodge of Theosophists a part of the time is devoted to Question and Answer. The questions and answers that follow were taken stenographically while "The Ocean of Theosophy," by Wm. Q. Judge, was being studied.

It should be remembered that while the answers are given from the standpoint of many years' experience and application, they are not to be taken as hard and fast definitions, nor as authoritative; but may be used as explanations and applications of the philosophy of Theosophy as related to the particular phases presented in the various questions. Each student, being "the final authority" for himself, should not accept any statement by any being whatever unless he himself perceives its truth.

Beginning with Chapter I of the "Ocean," the succeeding chapters will be taken up seriatim.

CHAPTER XII.

Q. The chapter speaks of Kamaloka *as a place; is it a place merely in a metaphysical sense?*

A. It is a place "physically" in that it is *a degree of substance* —the astral substance or atmosphere which surrounds the earth to an appreciable distance—composed of the physical and psychical emanations of the earth. But it is a metaphysical "place" so far as the consciousness of the person involved in it is concerned.

Q. Then the Kamalokic *plane is the astral plane?*

A. It is. We don't go to any particular locality to reach it, any more than we *go* anywhere in our dreaming state. Simply, we are in that state. And *Kamaloka* is like the dreaming state, in that it is temporary; when the energy that caused the dreams, whether good or bad, is used up, the man goes into his own nature as a person.

Q. If the Kamarupa *is devoid of consciousness, how can* Kamaloka *be likened to the dream-state, wherein the consciousness is active?*

A. It is not stated that *Kamaloka* is devoid of consciousness. We are, or may be in *Kamaloka* right now as we feel, but we are not *Kamarupas.* A man plunged into a state of gloom is in *Kamaloka* just as much as though he had disposed of his body. We should not confuse the body, or vehicle, with the consciousness employing it. Let us remember all the time that we, as Consciousness, are working in and upon substance; we are not to mistake the *forms* produced by Consciousness for the Consciousness itself.

Q. How soon does the Real Man leave the Kamalokic *state?*

A. The Real Man is for only a short time after the death of the body connected with the *Kamarupa;* during that time, he is tied to it much as he may be to the physical body at the present time; but he almost immediately lets go of this *Kamic* body, just as he has let go of the physical. The Real Man, in ordinary cases, goes practically at once into the *Devachanic* state. The *Kamarupa*

begins to disintegrate immediately, and continues to disintegrate very quickly, if it is not reinforced by mediumistic and other practices.

Q. Could there not be some cases in which the Real Man would be detained in Kamaloka?

A. The higher principles of an absolute materialist, or of one who has taken the first steps toward black magic, are still actually connected with the *Kamarupa,* but, otherwise, only some sort of an *internal* desire for something, strongly held, could detain the Ego. This would not generally be the case, for when the body dies, the seats of the desires, that is, the organs, lose their power of excitation. The memory of every cell and every organ fades out, when they are no longer part of an organic being, and so no further desire arises. There might be a period of only five minutes, fifteen minutes, or a year, when our desires would run along the lines that we had held during life, but they cannot renew themselves very well, since there is no seat for their operation. Only some very strong unsatisfied desire holds a *Kamarupa* in being for a long time, and the desire body may be renewed only by some extraneous pressure. Even if a *Kamarupa* existed as a coherent mass of tendencies for hundreds of years, it would not mean that the Ego was connected with it. If he were connected, he would have some control.

Q. Does the Kamic *body exist then as an entity separate and apart from the man who left it?*

A. Let us remember first, last, and always, that the Real Man has his visible and invisible constituents. The visible constituents are in the body; the invisible constituents are in the astral body. When the body is occupied, the man is there—the controlling power. When he drops the body, the body remains what it was. When he drops his astral body in *Kamaloka*, it remains just as he left it. He is not himself detained in *Kamaloka*, but his remains are there, as are here his remains on the physical plane, for a longer or shorter time or duration. The remains are not conscious in any way; they are useless to the man and uncontrollable by him. Even though they may have some effect on him, as like a numbing weight, because they have been a part of him, yet he is not conscious of the fact. If he were so conscious he would have control over them; his will would be operative. But, in fact, he is not there at all.

Q. Is there any suffering in Kamaloka?

A. Not for the Ego. The desires and passions that make up the *Kamarupa* go back to their own natures rendered all the happier for the change. They belong to the animal or *Kamic* world, not to astral matter.

Q. But are we not still responsible for the Kamarupa, *even when we have left* Kamaloka?

A. Yes; that *Kamarupa* is like a machine which we have not known how to operate and control. If it does damage to others,

we are responsible for the damage. We have to take charge of that old machine and keep at the task until we know how to control it.

Q. Would you say that the Kamalokic *condition is merely a continuance of the physical existence, in the sense that so many of our dreams are?*

A. In the majority of cases, one who dies a natural death has a *Kamalokic* existence analogous in time to the dreaming state which precedes deep sleep, but feelings and desires, along the lines of envy, revenge, anger, lust, are left there as forces, which keep on operating after the man has no further touch with them. He meets the results of these operations when he returns.

Q. Could we call the Kamarupa *a thought body?*

A. No, not a thought body; it is the residuum of thought—the effect of thought upon substance, or upon those lives which compose the substance. Every thought we have coalesces with some small life and gives it direction and impulse, but while that life, of itself, is not conscious, it will repeat the impulse given it until that energy dies out. Congeries of this kind of lives will be coherent for some time after the death of the body, and even after the person has gone to *Devachan*. The *Kamarupa* exists after the personality has left it, just as the physical body does after the soul departs from it; it still exists as a body, in its lives, and has its effect on other organisms.

Q. Do the Kamarupas *really affect or move us astrally?*

A. They exist absolutely devoid of consciousness or guidance of any kind, blown about by every attraction or repulsion. They have no will nor consciousnes, and can affect us only as we *attract* them by strong feeling, exhibiting lust, anger or envy.

Q. Are the three classes of Skandhas *the lives of the various planes?*

A. The *Skandhas* are the lives *plus* the impulsions that have been given those lives. The lives all belong to the one who evolved them, and all they know is the direction given them. They have no power of choice; they cannot initiate impulse, but merely receive it. So the *Skandhas* are our tendencies, the quality of force which we have imparted to the various lives in the various planes or departments of nature, physical, mental and psychical. We impel the physical lives in our bodies; we impel the astral counterparts which make physical expression possible; we impel the lives that have to do with our thought processes. As they have been impelled by us, they are connected to us by magnetic or electrical attraction, and when we return to earth we draw them back to us again, or energize the *Skandhas* of the three classes, which, we may see, make possible the operation of several classes of Karma at the same time.

Q. Then the whole teaching concerning the Skandhas *is merely another illustration of cause and effect?*

A. Yes, we cannot think, feel, say or do anything without starting some of the infinitesimal colorless lives, with which the

whole atmosphere pulsates everywhere, in a given direction. We are responsible for those lives because we created them as that kind of life. If the force put into our thought was very little, the direction may be short-lived, but strong thoughts and feelings energize strongly. The total of these lives is always existent on the physical and astral planes, and we draw them back to us as an aggregate because we were the creators and originators of them.

Q. How is it that the person leaving the body makes the review of his past life after the heart has stopped beating and the breathing is over, when a drowning person makes that same review still alive?

A. One drowning is on the very bridge of death, and according to the length of time he is on the bridge will be the extent of the review, which necessarily comes from the letting go—or the partial letting go—of the physical life. Although the doctors may have pronounced the death, so long as there is a spark of animal heat in the body, the brain still thinks. Because one cannot go forward, he must go back, and so the scroll is rolled up from the time of death or approaching death, and one reads the record of all his thoughts, words, deeds and impressions from the last moment back to the events of childhood.

Q. Would this review take place in one killed by an explosion?

A. Such a death is not completed. The man is still alive physically, mentally and morally, just as much as he was before the body was blown to pieces. He is minus the physical body, only, as are suicides and executed criminals. All those thrust suddenly out of life in such ways are really not dead; they have their tastes, desires and passions of every kind, which they can gratify only through a being occupying a physical body. One result of capital punishment is an increase in crime, because these bodiless men stimulate with their passions the minds of men already evilly inclined.

Q. What is the difference between the permanent and the ordinary astral body?

A. The ordinary astral is constructed on the basis of the *skandhas,* while the permanent astral is constructed during life on the basis of the aspirations and self-induced efforts, out of astral substance, but not exactly of the earthly astral substance. If one building a permanent astral gives way to anger or evil feelings in any direction, he destroys his building, but the old *skandhic* astral body is left in full play. One with a permanent astral never has a *Kamaloka,* nor a *Devachan,* for he knows too much, and cannot be drawn into those conditions. Then he comes back, working not only with tendencies, but with aspirations, knowledge and effort, which are permanent.

Q. What is the process by which the lower kingdoms are affected by our thoughts and aspirations? Is it possible to raise the lives in our body from the animal to the human plane?

A. The lives from the lower kingdoms, which we use in our bodies, are coming and going all the time. While they are within

our sphere of influence, they are impressed by us, and carry those impressions back into the lower kingdoms. Thence they are attracted to a human body again which has within it similar kinds of lives. Some lives, or those impressed by good, remain on the human plane, while lives impressed by evil go back to the lower kingdoms. We borrow our bodies from the earth, and keep renewing them all the time, so that the lives we impress with a right impulse will come back to us.

LIFE AND ACTION

CREATION, evolution, metempsychosis, transmigration, pre-existence, after-death survival, re-embodiment and re-incarnation, as well as many others of the words we use, are most frequently employed in an habitual or personal way, even among theosophists. It is but rarely that we reflect upon their larger significations and ramifications.

Yet in truth these words are *mantrams*. They have a magical meaning and power, if we will but employ them in their higher potentials. They are all related terms and could and should be used magically, *i. e.,* scientifically. What was H. P. B. trying to impress on us, apart from the ideas we, not she, put into the words she used? For, unless we admit to ourselves that she had a larger knowledge than we possess, and was trying to pass some of that knowledge on to us, what is the use of studying her message?

True, she had to employ the nomenclature we use for our language, for she knew our language and we did not know hers. Hers was the language of the soul. Ours is the language of Kama-Manas, the mind. She had to descend to our plane to communicate with us, but we have to essay to rise to hers to understand her. Her knowledge includes ours, but ours does not include hers.

In all her voluminous writings she was endeavoring to impart to us three great ideas and no more. If we can grasp them, we have the means to understand her, and not otherwise. By understanding and applying these three great ideas we can rise to her plane of being, and then, instead of endlessly and futilely trying to understand her plane of being from ours, we can study our plane of being from hers, and thereby learn the language and the wisdom of the soul, which includes all actions, things and beings of every kind.

Immortality refers to the One Life. The One Life is the only Reality there is, for it is all that endures ceaselessly. All else is incidental, accidental, or intentioned in Life, and does not exist apart from Life. It is Life itself that we are, and are to study This is the first and inclusive perception, and few indeed are those who realize it even in small degree, as the Self-existing, therefore

uncreate and undying, centre of their own being and of all being. There is nothing without life, we say, and then in our thoughts and actions deny its identity, its universal presence in all the kingdoms of nature, visible and invisible. Nothing and no one can create Life; nothing and no one can either preserve or destroy Life. Life itself is the creator, the preserver, the destroyer, of "all that was, is, or ever shall be."

Creation, preservation and destruction are the triple forms of the *action* of Life. This is the great idea of Karma, or Law. Behind all forms stands Life as their creator. Within all forms exists Life as their preserver. Within and without all forms is Life, eternally working in, on and through them, adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing, what? *Forms*. Beginning and ending, birth, life, death, bodies, sensations, minds, what do these refer and relate to? Never to anything but the forms produced by the action of Life. Life, Action, Form, are "the beginning, the middle, and the end of all existing things." What survives when this Universe shall have passed away with all in it? Life survives. What precedes any and all universes, our own included? Life precedes them all. What is the material and instrumental cause of this or any universe? Life itself is the cause.

Out of what are they evolved? Out of Life. In what do they exist? In Life. Into what do they return at their dissolution? Into Life.

How are they evolved? By Karma, the action of Life in and on Life. How are they maintained and preserved during their existence? By Karma. How are they dissolved and destroyed? By Karma.

Who and what are we? Life and nothing else than Life, nothing less than Life. How do we evolve bodies, minds, and forms of other kinds; how preserve and destroy them? By Karma: action of the Life in this form on the Life in other forms. Where were we before we entered this form? In another form. Where do we pass when we leave this form? Into another form. Few indeed are those who realize the universal law by which all that is gained is gained and all that is lost is lost, any more than they realize who is the gainer and the loser of all. By Karma we rise to higher forms; by Karma we sink to lower forms. When we rise to the higher we include the lower; when we sink to the lower we lose the higher. This rising and falling is the *cycle* of Karma; creation and re-creation are its *process*.

Metempsychosis, transmigration, re-incarnation, then, are words that refer both to Life and to Karma, because they are included in the one and are the process of the other. Karma it is which is created by Life, sustained by Life, destroyed by Life through being transformed into a higher or a lower form. But Life is not thereby affected in the slightest.

What is the highest form of Karma? Intelligence, we answer. It is only by Intelligence that there is either creation, preservation

or destruction of form on any plane of being. What is the lowest form of Karma? Ignorance, we answer; it is only through Ignorance that anything is created, preserved or destroyed.

"Ah-ha," we hear some one say; "now we have caught you in a paradox, an inconsistency that your subtlety and sophism cannot reconcile or explain away. How can Intelligence and Ignorance be *both* of them the cause of all creation, preservation and destruction, when even a fool knows that these two are as wide apart as the Poles?"

My friend, this paradox can neither be reconciled nor explained. But that it is the *fact,* all Nature bears witness. And although it can neither be reconciled nor explained, *it can be understood* by understanding and applying to any and all the facts the three great ideas H. P. B. did her best to place before us for our consideration. She succeeded in her task, but we have not as yet succeeded in ours, because we do not consider enough, neither long enough nor deeply enough, what she placed before us.

Only Life is Absolute; all else is relative, finite, conditioned. *Only* Life is immortal; all else is mortal, perishable, transitory. Do we grasp that fact? If so, then we can see that both the mortal and the immortal, both the finite and the infinite, are the very paradox and seeming inconsistency that everywhere confront us, awaiting our solution. Intelligence is not absolute. Ignorance is not absolute. The lowest form we can contact chooses one thing rather than another; and so does the highest. What makes them choose? The Intelligence in them; what else can it be? The lowest and most minute physical forms have in them something which has intelligence and exercises the power of choice. We see it in chemical affinities and repulsions, in the compounds and mixtures of the mineral kingdom, in the growth of plants, in the actions of the animal kingdom, in ourselves; and always the higher the form the greater the range of possible choice. And higher means only the intelligence within the form, not the form itself. And all that is true of the physical forms is equally true of the forms we know only as forces and energies. There is something in them which makes them choose one channel rather than another. We cannot, for example, get electricity to choose glass as a vehicle, and it will travel more freely through copper than through iron. How could this be if there were, literally, no sense in the electricity, or the glass or the copper or the iron; if they, also, did not have their several affinities and repulsions, if, in other words, they did not have and exercise the power of choice? Is there any difference, except in form, in their bodies and ours, their actions and ours, their likes and dislikes and ours, their intelligence and ours?

But since the intelligence of all beings is relative, not absolute, their ignorance relative, not absolute, it follows that results flow from the actions of any being that he could not foresee, and by these unlooked-for results he is brought into entirely new relations, good, bad or indifferent, with other beings, so that he continually

finds himself where he is exercising his power of choice in partial intelligence and partial ignorance. He is thence continually rising and falling, continually alternating between the two poles of action, or Karma: Wisdom and Ignorance; and what is wise in one relation is foolish in another. No action, then, is absolutely wise, or absolutely unwise. So the highest being in the Universe sooner or later must find himself in the very lowest of relations, and the lowest being in the universe must sooner or later find himself in the very highest relations. This alternation of relations is the Law of Cycles, which is also a form of Karma.

Nature means all there is, visible and invisible, and as each being is a part of Nature, it follows that in the vast inclusive cycle called a Manvantara he must contact over and over again everything in nature. If he has never contacted a given part of nature before, then he will act in ignorance. If he has contacted it so many times that he understands its particular degree of intelligence, then he will act in that relation with wisdom. The degree of wisdom attainable in any manvantara by any being must necessarily be limited to the acquirement of an understanding of the ultimate essence of everything in nature: Life, Action, Form. When he understands that all forms spring from action, and all action springs from Life and exists in Life, then he performs all his actions for the sake of Life, no matter what the relations calling for his choice. He has the whole of nature for his object, not just a part of nature, however large a portion that part may be. Which is but to say that he consciously embodies the three great ideas of H. P. B., which are henceforth his, not hers only.

He becomes himself the conscious chooser of whatever form, whether of intelligence, embodiment or action, that he shall employ, and thereby governs himself his relations with all beings of every kind. Incarnation and action become for him an instrument, only, in the service of life. He acts for and as the Self in no matter what instrument or relation, and all selves are his implements.

This is Spiritual evolution, as distinct from intellectual, psychical, or physical evolution; Spiritual Karma or action, as distinguished from any other kind of Karma. All forms of embodiment and action are included in this spiritual knowledge or Intelligence, the lowest as well as the highest. Can we wonder, then, that Jesus said, "unto the pure all things are pure"? Or that Krishna voiced the same great truth in saying to his disciple, "he, O Arjuna, who by the similitude found in himself seeth but One Essence in all things, whether *they* be good or evil, is considered to be the most excellent devotee."

Long ago our spiritual Intelligence caused us to choose to embody ourselves in lower forms of Life than our own, both for the sake of helping them onward in their physical, psychical and intellectual evolution, and ourselves remedying the defects in our spiritual education. We absorbed their natures and they absorbed

something of ours. We "incarnated" in them, and they also "incarnated" in us. We look through their eyes in some things and they through ours in other things. So far from our Intelligence. But since we were by no means "perfect" ourselves, *i. e., absolute* in our intelligence, it followed that we came into many hitherto unknown relations and performed many actions from ignorance and not from knowledge. And the effects of these actions, wise and unwise, we are all experiencing all the time. When we cease from the day's work and go to sleep at night, we get only a temporary release. When we waken in the morning, what confronts us? Unfulfilled duties every time. When we cease from this body at death, we get only a temporary release from the activities of human existence. When we waken again at birth, what confronts us? Unlearned lessons every time.

When we depart in sleep, it is not to extinction or unconsciousness, but only to another, let us hope for the time being, higher form of Karma or action, a form that may or may not have any direct relation with the form of action here. And so after death. But when, sleeping or waking or dreaming, in the physical body in life or in another body after death, all our Karma has one Object, and one only, the service of the Self, then we can reasonably infer that a direct relation begins to be built up by the unity of our choice and action, and this direct relation continued must eventuate soon or late in the evolution of a Spiritual Form that is independent of, because inclusive of, all lesser and lower forms, and we go on our way rejoicing in our conscious immortality.

SOME HELPFUL EXTRACTS*

"A knot of ignorance binds all men's hearts; this action looses and God's grace imparts."

—*Hindi Verse.*

"Study all Scriptures written, near or far;
Worship all images and saints of earth;
But if you do not study who you are,
All your best actions are nothing worth."

—*Sanscrit Verse.*

"There is a living creature in heaven which by day has 'Truth' upon its forehead, by which the angels know it is day; but in the evening it has 'Faith' on its forehead, whereby the angels know that night is near."

—*From the Kabalistic Book, Kitzur-Sh-lh, Fol. 42, Col. 2.*

---

*These Extracts were printed by William Q. Judge in *The Path*, September and December, 1886. The title used is our own. (Editors Theosophy.)

ON THE LOOKOUT

That belief in the existence of "Black Magic," and its operators, still persists in the minds of some men even in this "enlightened and scientific" generation, is evidenced by the following news item, printed among others under the caption, "Arizona Notes," in the Los Angeles *Times* of October 22nd:

> John Dietz, a Glendale rancher, in jail for attempting the life of John Bloomer, a Swiss farmhand, tries to justify himself by a story, supported by his wife's evidence, that Bloomer, an elderly man, has an evil eye, and that he had succeeded in throwing a spell over the family, whereupon Dietz, returning from Los Angeles, was impelled to commit indiscretions, for which he later suffered, physically and mentally. Dietz does not appear in the least insane and tells his story in matter of fact manner.

That "Dietz *does not appear in the least insane*" is sufficiently interesting to this news-writer to warrant mention, but how far the "evil eye" plea of justification will go in a present-day court of law remains to be seen. In *Isis Unveiled,* Volume 1, Page 380, H. P. Blavatsky writes: "Many persons firmly believe that certain individuals possess the power of the evil eye. The *mal'occhio,* or *jettatura* is a belief which is prevalent throughout Italy and Southern Europe. The Pope is held to be possessed—perchance unconsciously—of that disagreeable gift. There are persons who can kill toads by merely looking at them, and can even slay individuals. The malignance of their desire brings evil forces to a focus, and the death-dealing bolt is projected, as though it were a bullet from a rifle." Is it possible that Rancher Dietz and his family suffered from some modification, or application, of the power referred to—and took the only means he could think of—physical violence—to break the effects of the influence? The actual facts in this case would be interesting, but probably they will never get into the court records.

At the international conference of women physicians, held in New York in October, Miss Grace Fulmer, formerly assistant superintendent of schools of Los Angeles, urged the abolition of examinations and merit marks as a means of inducing children to study. If this means putting the soft pedal upon the idea of *competition,* at whatever expense to others, among children at school, Theosophical students can well agree with Miss Fulmer. When she continues, however, by saying that education should appeal to the child as a *form of play,* we cannot full-heartedly follow her. The nation suffers enough already from the almost resistless desire for "play" and pleasure, that afflicts the adults of the race—to say nothing of its children. Our youth needs to be taught to respect honest *work,* how to get about it and carry it through. School work can be made *interesting:* that would be a good start in carrying out a serious educational reform. Competent teachers will not need to invent games and simulate "play" to accomplish this.

At the same session of the conference the whole educational system of the United States was denounced as faulty. One of the speakers, Dr. Wilfred Lay of New York, remarked that the child is regarded as a miniature adult, and methods of instruction are adopted in accordance with that idea. "The child is just as different from the adult as the caterpillar from the moth," she said, "and it is no wonder that those who are trying to train children as if they were adults are so poorly paid." There is some truth in Dr. Lay's statement, but it is much easier to denounce and tear down than it is to build up. No truly constructive educational system can be worked out until the great facts of Karma and Reincarnation are more generally understood, and particularly in their application to "children." We will then not be quite so anxious to pour our little ones into the uniform moulds of a general educational plan, but will consider them rather

as *individuals*—not "classes" or "generations"—and try to meet their growing needs as such.

The Protestant Episcopal Church, whose triennial general convention was held in Detroit in October, rejected the recommendation of its prayer-book revision committee to include a prayer for the blessing of graves. The rejection seems to have been effected not so much for religious reasons, but because a possible division of the church itself was threatened. Does it seem possible that mature men and women will break a united effort of many years' standing on account of differences of opinion over some non-essential matter? History shows that is just what mature men and women actually do, when their "unity" is based on anything but a foundation of self-evident principles. Even Theosophical organizations have been broken over trifles, when the persons who composed them failed to take Theosophy itself, the true and unifying Wisdom-Religion itself, as their *basis for union.* The recent convention of Mrs. Besant's Theosophical Society in Chicago developed a bitter fight, the causes for which would never have existed if that organization, or any considerable number of its members, devoted themselves to the dissemination of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles. The Episcopalians outlined a broad social policy for the church, Bishop Brewster suggesting a stand for right and justice everywhere—living wages, the principle of collective bargaining, freedom of the individual worker from coercion, a part for the employed in the internal management of industry, a weekly rest day, stopping of exploitation of labor of women and children, placing economics on a broader basis, etc., etc. He declared: "The social democratic trend may be traced to the gospel of Jesus Christ. We are witnessing the end of an age of individualism and the coming of an age of social co-operation. In the new era the church has a duty." These are brave words to come from the mouth of a high functionary of one of the most reactionary of the many Christian Churches, but it is certain that they are not *Episcopalian,* and can it be possible that Bishop Brewster has failed to recognize that the church *had* a duty before this day of turmoil showed itself, and that one of the important factors in bringing about present-day stresses may be found in the failure of the church to understand and interpret human needs? "The gospel of Jesus Christ," to which he refers, has been with us all the time, but it is certain that the church has not heeded it. In the Bishop's present position may once more be seen the spectacle of the church hurrying up to keep pace with the people, who have long since outstripped it, and to whom as a living power in their lives it is worse than meaningless.

Writing in *The New Age* for October, Horace Parker McIntosh, 33 Hon., illustrates in his article, "Immortality," how easily an excellent and well-trained mind can hold two completely oppositional concepts, and yet not be aware of it. Mr. McIntosh recognizes the universality of Law, and at the same time refers to God in unmistakable terms of *being,* as an Omnipotent Lawgiver," an "Omnipotent Being," a "Great Creator," as "infinite." None of these terms can properly be applied to *being,* in any sense in which the word is used among men. Thus, no being can be "infinite:" infinity implies without beginning or ending, and no being (form), however high, can possibly be that. Again, an "Omnipotent Lawgiver" is a logical absurdity, unless miracles are admitted as facts—and no believer in Law can at the same time credit "miracles." Law is *inherent* in all beings; a being acts, and receives the reaction therefrom; no action, no reaction; no being, no action. It is as simple as that, when basically considered. The "Aphorisms on Karma," by Wm. Q. Judge, would open a new world of ideas for Mr. McIntosh, and we believe he would quickly find himself in full agreement therewith; for he very evidently has accepted reincarnation as the process of growth, and reincarnation cannot be understood except in connection with the doctrine of Karma, or Law. To quote:

And so, when we are weighed down by years and by the burden and heat of this life, we shall go away somewhere for the rest and refreshment which cannot be found here; and by and by we shall come back again and yet again, until we shall have learned all the things that we *must* learn here before we can go higher. And, finally, when we shall have arrived at the goal, at the great aim and object of all life, when we shall have "overcome," we shall be "children of God, being children of the resurrection," and we shall "go no more out."

Another writer in the same issue of *The New Age,* Henry R. Evans, Litt. D., 33 Hon., makes an interesting statement. Writes Mr. Evans: "The great thinkers of India have never doubted the existence of the soul and its immortality, *with the exception, perhaps, of Buddha.*" The words italicised by us are those to which *we* take exception. THEOSOPHY would like to know how Mr. Evans arrived at the idea that Buddha doubted the existence of the soul and its immortality. We inquire with full consideration of his employment of the undogmatic word "perhaps." In her "Key to Theosophy," Madame Blavatsky shows quite clearly the difference between *exoteric* and *esoteric* Buddhism, the first denying the existence of any Deity, and any conscious *post mortem* life, the latter affirming immortality. She says Buddha's esoteric teachings were simply the Gupta-Vidya, or secret knowledge, of the ancient Brahmans, "the key to which their modern successors have, with few exceptions, completely lost." She writes: "And this Vidya has passed into what is now known as the *inner* teachings of the Mahayana School of Northern Buddhism. Those who deny it are simply ignorant pretenders to Orientalism. I advise you to read Rev. Mr. Edkin's *Chinese Buddhism*—especially the chapters on the exoteric and *esoteric* schools and teachings—and then compare the testimony of the whole ancient world upon the subject." She explains, further, that Buddha had his initiated disciples, just as Jesus had, to whom "he taught the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven;" that He also taught the multitudes in parables, quoting Buddha's dialogue with his initiated disciple, Ananda (translated by Oldenburg from the *Samyuttaka Nikaya*), which explains why He concealed the true doctrine from the crowd. He withheld the difficult metaphysical doctrines from the masses in order not to perplex them more; for Buddha had to give the death blow to an exuberance of unhealthy fancy and fanatical superstition, such as has rarely been known before or after—a condition into which the Brahmans, jealous of their superior knowledge, had driven millions of their fellow-countrymen. Again, Buddha was the first to embody those lofty ethics in his public teachings which were once the common property of the initiates of all nations. These ethics cannot be applied and understood except on the basis of man's immortality. Mr. Evans will find food for thought along that line alone.

The Methodist Church has succeeded in raising a centenary fund of $160,000,000. In commenting upon the fact, Mr. E. S. Martin of the editorial department of *Life,* asks the question: Are the Methodists civilized? "They strike the contemplative mind as a fairly wild and rampageous lot of people, with contracted ideas of human life, and an urgent disposition to pare down their fellow-creatures to the dimensions of that restricted model. Most of them would regard as a joke the intimation that Methodists are laggers rather than leaders in civilization, but a lot of strong, enthusiastic support can be had for the suggestion that these centenary millions could not be better spent for civilization than to finance a great movement to civilize the Methodists." Mr. Martin thinks that to be really civilized is far more than to have learned the rudiments of living on this earth. He declares it is "a great achievement, mental and spiritual, not readily to be compassed in a high degree by the mass of any people"—with which the LOOKOUT must agree. But can the members of any church or sect, *if dogmatic,* be truly civilized? Is it "civilized" to condemn others because they do not believe, or think, as we do? Is it "civilized" to try to force others

—quite inoffensive people—to adopt our own standards of thought, of morality, of conduct, of religion? Is there any education in a true sense in dogmatism, or force? Apply the obvious answer to these questions to the church practice of "foreign missions," and note how utterly *un*civilized such methods must essentially be. Theosophy teaches that man must progress by self-devised and self-induced exertions in every department of life; that he reaps what he sows, and learns better sowing from the effects perceived from what he reaps; that no man can do another's thinking and learning for him; that the acceptance of formulas and dogmas by belief is not, never was and never will be, knowledge; that the purpose of life *is* to learn, and that our wonderful and complex human life exists for the purposes and emancipation of the soul. Civilization will begin for the masses when they take home to themselves, and definitely work from, the common-sense, natural basis presented by Theosophy. But when have the masses been philosophical! It is for the few who can in any way sense what a true civilization must be, to "come out from among them and be separate," so far as idea and motive are concerned—not assuming any "holier than thou" attitude, nor withdrawing from the world as did the monks of old, but living as "civilized" beings among and with the great uncivilized. The time must come when the little leaven will leaven the whole lump, crude and noisy as it now seems to be. To live such a life *consciously* is an heroic task, but there are those who have done it, those who are doing it, those who will do it. "The great and peaceful ones live regenerating the world like the coming of spring, and after having themselves crossed the ocean of embodied existence, help those who try to do the same thing, without personal motives."

In reviewing a recent book by Dr. John Mills, "The Realities of Modern Science," *Current Opinion* heads the article, in its October issue, "The Plight of Physics Between the Nucleus and the Electron. A door seems to have slammed in the face of Science." Says the reviewer:

> "The atoms of chemistry are no longer regarded as indivisible particles. An atom * * * always consists of a number of electrons and another part which is called the nucleus. These electrons are little bits of electricity. Further than to say that electrons are electricity we cannot go, however, affirms Dr. John Mills, the most practical of living physicists, whose book on the realities of modern science affords us these details. We can say, he observes, that matter is molecular, that molecules are composed of atoms and that atoms are formed of electrons. * * * But as to the electron itself no explanation can be given.
>
> If any explanation is ever obtained it will be in terms of something else, which in its turn will be unexplainable and have to be accepted as the fundamental element or beginning from which all other explanations start. The electron is the fundamental entity with which modern science starts.
>
> But what is the nucleus?
>
> That we do not as yet know * * *."

In considering this nucleus, Doctor Mills asks what is its character, answering that it is such as to attract toward itself electricity and in general to hold within the atomic radius the various electrons of the atom. He continues:

> "We may say, then, that the nucleus is itself electricity, but of a different kind from that of the electron. * * * In fact, there is evidence that the nucleus itself contains some electrons. * * * The point to be noted is that, even the scientists are not yet able to speak definitely of the composition of the nucleus, there is sufficient evidence to warrant our bearing in mind the possibility that the nuclei of all the atoms may some day be found to be formed by the combination of electrons and a number of positive elemental charges all just like the positive nucleus of the hydrogen atom."

It would seem to LOOKOUT that the time is arriving when Science can no longer logically speak of these "ultimates" of matter in terms of matter, but rather in terms of "force"—force implying *consciousness,* or *spirit.* And the direct implication of such words as the foregoing is *intelligence* of some degree, for forces do not move of themselves. The "nucleus" of the atom must correspond to the intelligent or conscious aspect of that atom —to speak in terms of being, its *soul*—and that portion of the atom outside the nucleus must be its container, or sphere of influence—its *body,* to use a word. That which Science terms the electron is not physical in a materialistic sense—it is *meta*-physical, just as the atom is. For the conscious intelligences that produce the objective material universe are not themselves objective, nor is the substance upon which they act physical substance. Theosophy teaches that behind and within physical matter there is a finer and more ethereal "astral" matter—undoubtedly that "new form of matter unrecognized by physics" which is referred to in the same issue of *Current Opinion,* in its review of "Realities of Psychic Phenomena," by W. J. Crawford, B. Sc.. who has been investigating spiritualistic phenomena. And behind and within "astral" matter are still finer and finer states—all of them *states,* it should be understood, of matter itself, which is the undivided, homogeneous *substance,* Spirit-Matter. Writes H. P. Blavatsky in the *Secret Doctrine* (Vol. 1, p. 567 orig. ed.,; p. 620 third ed.):

> Modern Physics, in borrowing from the Ancients their Atomic Theory, forgot one point, the most important point of the doctrine; hence they have got only the husks and will never be able to get the kernel. In adopting physical Atoms, they omitted the suggestive fact that, from Anaxagoras to Epicurus, to the Roman Lucretius, and finally even to Galileo, all these Philosophers believed more or less in *animated* Atoms, not in invisible specks of so-called "brute" matter. According to them, rotary motion was generated by larger (Read, more divine and pure) Atoms forcing other Atoms downwards; the lighter ones being simultaneously thrust upward. The Esoteric meaning of this is the ever cyclic curve of differentiated Elements downward and upward through intercyclic phases of existence, until each again reaches its starting point or birthplace. The idea was metaphysical as well as physical; the hidden interpretation embracing Gods or Souls, in the shape of Atoms, as the *causes* of all of the *effects* produced on Earth by the *secretions* from the divine bodies. No Ancient Philosopher, not even the Jewish Kabalists, ever dissociated Spirit from Matter, or Matter from Spirit.

A press dispatch emanating from London and accredited to Associated Press Foreign Correspondence deals interestingly with "Infant prodigies" that "are being discovered in England almost daily", and states that "Some connect this with the psychology of the war"—a phrase that is sufficiently indefinite, even if it has an intelligent sound. The dispatch enumerates some interesting cases: a thirteen-year-old girl artist who has never taken any drawing lessons, and whose work is taken quite seriously by the critics; a four-year-old boy, child of non-musical parents, who has outranked forty-three competitors, most of them in their twenties, after six months of tuition on the violin; a little seven-year-old "clairvoyant", with whom his elders have been experimenting, is also mentioned as having "wonderful powers". Theosophical students who make some practical application of the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation will be able to explain these "infant prodigies" —as the scientists and psychologists will not, however gravely and ponderously they emit learned opinions. It was of these last, the psychologists, that H. P. B. predicted they "would have their work cut out for them" in this century. Mention was also made of the "strange" and "queer" children who would begin to come into incarnation. In this connection, however, Theosophists may take heart, for the Teacher also stated unequivocally that in century the 20th the *Secret Doctrine* would become "the text-book of science". Speed the day!